With preceding

AN

APPENDIX

TO

AN ESSAY

ON

DESIGN IN GARDENING,

BY GEORGE MASON,

Which was printed in MDCCXCV.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR JOHN WHITE, FLEET-STREET.

MDCCXCVIII.

APPENDIX

AN

APPENDIX, &c.

THIS ſhort Appendix is chiefly in reply to ſome expreſſions of Mr. PRICE's in the *re-publication* * of his *Eſſay on the Picturesque.* By my manner of beginning this little piece I ſhall at leaſt ſhew myſelf ready to acknowledge a miſtake. An egregious one it cer-

* In 1796. The reader is deſired not to confound this *re-publication* of the *Eſſay on the Picturesque* with Mr. PRICE's *ſecond volume* juſt publiſhed. This Appendix was written ſoon after I had ſeen Mr. PRICE's re-publication, but was not thought by me of ſufficient magnitude to be printed by itſelf. The Pamphlet is now rendered a little leſs ſcanty, by the addition of another Appendix, in reply to a few more remarks of Mr. PRICE's in his recent volume of Eſſays.

tainly was of mine (in p. 109 of my own Eſſay) to tax Mr. PRICE with having cenſured KENT for his *plantations of young beeches.* However, the concluſion of my cenſure plainly indicates, that I doubted my own interpretation of the paſſage in Mr. PRICE; but, not having marked the page, I neglected to ſearch again for the ſentence I had attacked, and thus (much to my own mortification) let the erroneous objection continue unexpunged. A reaſon (of a very diſagreeable kind—to myſelf) induced me, whilſt reviſing Mr. PRICE's book, to be content with reading this paſſage in it very imperfectly; for I laboured under a peculiar infirmity of eye-ſight (occaſioned by a blow), and it was for a long while irkſome to me to read at all. But that Mr. PRICE [ſee his note p. 251] ſhould regard this overſight, as a wilful miſ-repreſentation on my part, is really a matter of aſtoniſhment. The very plain import of Mr. PRICE's ſentence (when read *throughout)* might have ſecured

me

me from ſuch an imputation. Who would *purpoſely* expoſe himſelf to the public for deficiency of common apprehenſion?

Mr. PRICE (p. 111) clearly avoids that identical error, which I was led into by my blindneſs; for he quotes a ſentence of mine *verbatim*: "The majority of thinking and "learned men, whom it has been my lot to "converſe with on ſuch ſubjects, are as well "perſuaded of *terror* being the cauſe of *ſub-*"*lime*, as that Tenterden ſteeple is of Good-"win ſands." I wiſh, Mr. PRICE had equally "taken care" not to miſconſtrue theſe words, as he has to "copy them very exactly." He might have ſaved himſelf the trouble of filling pages with an inapplicable cenſure, and me from the neceſſity of replying to him. "*The* cauſe" and "*a* cauſe" are by no means ſynonymous expreſſions. "The cauſe" both by the import of this article, and by the ſenſe conveyed in the context, clearly means that *neceſſary* and *univerſal* cauſe, maintained by

Mr. BURKE in his chapter on Terror: "Ter-
"ror is *in all caſes whatſoever*, either more
"openly or latently, *the ruling* principle of
"the ſublime." Surely controverting Mr. BURKE's poſition, and controverting the part of terror in particular ſublime paſſages of authors, ancient or modern, are two widely different things. The mere *vicinity* of terror and ſublime is admitted by the very ſimile of Tenterden ſteeple and Goodwin ſands; but that ſuch vicinity (as in this old ſaying) ſhould make one become *the ſole* cauſe of the other, is glanced at as glaringly abſurd. Mr. PRICE's further diſputation on this ſubject, being entirely between himſelf, and his own miſ-conception, concerns not me: he may interpret as erroneouſly as he pleaſes, and paſs what cenſure he pleaſes—on his own miſ-interpretation. I will barely remark, on how little grounds he reckons LONGINUS of his party. In the five rules, given by that famous critic for creating the *ſublime*, *terror* has no place at all.

all. *Terrific* indeed are his quotations from Homer; but the love-ode of Sappho is his choſen inſtance of the *pitch* of ſublime. I will not deny, but that Sappho's ode has ſomething of *terror* in it; but would any one ſay, from a full peruſal of Longinus, that he meant to call *terror* "the ruling principle of the ſublime?"

Mr. PRICE (p. 114) falls next on the propriety of "my proving by ſo many quota-
"tions (under the title of Claſſical Landſcapes)
"that the ancients had eyes juſt like our own,
"and were ſtruck and pleaſed with rocks,
"woods, and water, juſt as we are." *This* paſſage in Mr. PRICE's Eſſay is certainly not taken *verbatim* from my own, where (p. 27) the reaſon given for theſe quotations runs thus: "Were only claſſical authorities con-
"ſulted, it would hardly be ſuppoſed, that,
"even from the earlieſt ages, any conſiderable
"variation in taſte ever had prevailed." This obſervation Mr. PRICE (p. 115) thoroughly

aſſents to, but thinks its *ſelf-evidence* a ſtrong objection to dwelling on the ſubject. If Mr. PRICE had looked into my note p. 22, and at pages 35, 36, 46, and 167 of my Eſſay, he might have ſeen, that what he calls *evident* had been particularly denied by three eminent writers, two of whom (the Author of the *Engliſh Garden* and Mr. WALPOLE) Mr. PRICE himſelf has highly commended, and ſeemed to be thoroughly acquainted with. Mr. PRICE might alſo have known from p. 167, which I have juſt referred to, that for theſe reaſons the *number* of claſſical quotations far exceeded that of thoſe in my original Eſſay—which *number* it is, Mr. PRICE expreſsly objects to. Thus a *partial* inſpection into another's book has led more than myſelf into error.—But what idea muſt readers entertain of any writer's *literary* ſtability, who deems himſelf "*authoriſed*" by the very *fault* he finds, to adopt it for his *example?*

Thus much ſeemed neceſſary for me to publiſh,

liſh, in order to clear myſelf from an imputation of meaning, what nobody in his ſenſes would have meant; and alſo from that of having aſſerted what I never dreamt of aſſerting. I ſee no more in Mr. PRICE's re-publication, which I am particularly called upon to anſwer—unleſs indeed it lies upon me, to give any kind of reply to Mr. PRICE, where he takes up ſuch a ſingular way of parrying the force of the word *round* in the lines I had quoted from Dr. Warton's poem. Mr. PRICE firſt lays it down, that "a knowledge of the prin-" ciples of painting, and an acquaintance with " the works of the higher artiſts [are almoſt " neceſſary] for obtaining juſt ideas of natural " ſcenery." Then, by charging Dr. Warton with a defective intuition into *Titian's* manner, he ſuppoſes (if he means to ſuppoſe any thing *to the point at iſſue)* that conſequently Dr. Warton was incapable of diſcerning what was *round* in nature, when he ſaw it. One muſt be ſurpriſingly attached to an aſſumed

idea,

idea, to make it the ground of a ratiocination like this. Nor is Mr. PRICE's poſition itſelf well reconcileable to his own acknowledgment of taſte in natural landſcape among the *ancients*. For what principles of *landſcape-painting*, or what *maſters in that way* could *they* have ſtudied, to form "juſt ideas of natural ſcenery?" —But I wiſh not to revive a diſpute. Thoſe, who are the readieſt to claim and exerciſe a general freedom of animadverſion, as an undeniable privilege of penmen, are ſometimes the laſt to bear it—on themſelves. I would only expreſs my hopes, that I have not unwittingly forgotten two principal requiſites for fair diſquiſition — keeping to the point—and keeping one's temper.

SECOND

SECOND APPENDIX.

SECOND APPENDIX.

THE firſt paſſage in Mr. PRICE's *ſecond* volume, which calls upon me to vindicate myſelf, is a note to the 7th page of the Preface. This will detain me but little. For Mr. PRICE's inſtance, by which he would ſtrengthen his own argument, thoroughly refutes it. I had ſaid (according to Mr. PRICE's way of wording the ſubſtance of my ſentences) "that HAMILTON and SHENSTONE were the "true examples of the Engliſh taſte in garden-"ing." This certainly was, and is my opinion; in ſupport of which I refer my readers to pages 186, and 7, of my own publication. Mr. PRICE thinks, he has ſufficiently anſwered all that has been advanced on this head, only by obſerving, that "Pouſſin and Le Sueur were mo-

"dels

"dels of ſimplicity, and were the two moſt "celebrated painters of their country; yet "who would call ſimplicity the characteriſtic "of the French ſchool?" Pouſſin and Le Sueur ſtood (as it were) alone in France, with regard to their ſtyle of painting. But was this the caſe with the gardening of HAMILTON and SHENSTONE? or have I not proved the contrary (in my *diſcuſſion* on the taſte of Great Britain) from p. 111 to p. 144? If a cenſurer will ſhut his eyes againſt ſo conſiderable a portion of the book he cenſures, can his examination of it be a fair one? The works of HAMILTON and SHENSTONE, and of *many more voluntary artiſts*, were *generally* preferred by the public to thoſe of any *profeſſor* in the art. So that Mr. PRICE's reply is in effect no reply at all, but his ſtatement of the taſte of our country, in my humble opinion, confirmedly erroneous. For, if there is no ſtronger argument to be adduced in favour of it, I cannot help regarding the point as abſolutely conceded.

Mr.

Mr. PRICE (at the bottom of p. 6) quotes the following paſſage from p. 104 of my own Eſſay; where I aſk, "whether nature is a more "pleaſing object in a dwindled and ſhrivelled "condition, than when 'her vigour is as 'great, her beauty as freſh, and her looks as 'charming, as if ſhe newly came out of the 'forming hands of her Creator.' Mr. PRICE then proceeds to ſuppoſe, that this paſſage "ſeems to mean (if it means any thing) that "pieces of artificial water, as they have gene-"rally been made, of one equal verdure and "ſmoothneſs, look as if they were the imme-"diate productions of the Creator; while na-"tural lakes and rivers (the banks of which "muſt always be partially worn or broken) "ſhew nature in a dwindled and ſhrivelled "condition." It is very unlucky that Mr. PRICE ſhould never cite a paſſage of mine *verbatim* without miſ-conſtruing it. Have I through the whole of this obſervation (which Mr. PRICE has taken in hand, partly in his

firſt, and partly in his ſecond volume) ſo much as intimated an approbation of *even verdure?* Have I not confined my remark to the *water* itſelf, and the *hollow* adapted to contain it? Do the words "dwindled and ſhrivelled" extend to any thing beyond theſe? After Mr. PRICE by his own peculiar expoſition has ſo exceedingly perverted my meaning, no wonder that he ſhould doubt "if I mean any thing." I certainly mean the plain import of the words, I have either written, or cited. Theſe Mr. PRICE (in his firſt volume) has very unfoundedly conſtrued into a *general* defence of thoſe artificial waters he condemns; though they are manifeſtly but an argument againſt Mr. PRICE's objection to FULNESS. In this true light Mr. PRICE *there* conſidered the paſſage at ſome length, but put no different interpretation on what I had quoted from LORD SHAFTESBURY. This was an *after-thought.* Or was Mr. PRICE even *then* of the ſame opinion? only he forbore to mention it, leſt taking

a paragraph in two ſenſes *at once* might not have been ſo *popular*.—But *now* Mr. PRICE openly declares againſt any imitation of *unblemiſhed* Nature; and ſays, (p. 8) "All we are "concerned in, is the preſent appearance of "things, and her preſent operations." To the perpetuation of what ſtrange deformities would this maxim lead us? All the ravages of time, or of natural calamities, muſt be deemed ſacred and inviolable: to attempt reſtoring the face of this earth to its primitive perfection, muſt be prohibited: we muſt ſacrifice to the *Picturesque* with a vengeance. An avowal of ſuch doctrines in their utmoſt extent would literally verify the ſarcaſm in the *Purſuits of Literature* on *improvements by neglect*. Suitable, I will own, are ſhrivelled waters, and a conſequent diſplay of their time-worn banks, to ſcenes that are diſtinguiſhedly characterized by objects in a ſtate of decay. But who would transfer the ſame ideas to the water at Painshill? *Primeval beauty* at his lake HAMILTON

well knew for its propereſt inveſtment—within a Garden of Eden.

As to the note, which Mr. PRICE has choſen to ſubjoin to this diſputation (and which I am ſo prepoſterouſly included in)—what has it to do with me, who was the firſt that wrote againſt BROWN's deſigns, and have almoſt invariably condemned them? And, for the note itſelf, I had infinitely rather be the object of it, than have compoſed ſuch another.

Mr. PRICE's ſecond Eſſay treats of a ſubject, on which I had entertained great hopes of being much inſtructed by ſo eminent a deſigner. My own idea of this matter I have thus conciſely expreſt in my 89th page: "My opinion is, that no general precept is "here admiſſible; but that the ſtyle of em-"belliſhment, cloſe to a manſion, ſhould be "ſuggeſted by the particular nature of the "premiſes." I find nothing in this Eſſay of Mr. PRICE's, which does not coincide with the ſenſe of the paſſage I have now quoted

from my own; and I learn little more from Mr. PRICE's 70 pages. I can diſcover in them no poſitive direction: ſomething like principles they contain, but by no means of a general nature. There are ſpecific hypothetical caſes; but next to no ſpecific precepts how to manage them.

Mr. PRICE's third Eſſay—as a writer on gardening I have no immediate concern with.

ADDITIONAL CORRECTIONS OF THE ESSAY.

Page 5, line 6, and wherever the word occurs, for 'ſynonimous' read 'ſynonymous.'
16, line 9, dele 'he.'
20, in the firſt note, for 'tectæ' read 'tecta.'
35, line 5, for 'irradiancy of' read 'th'irradiance of a'
37, line 4, for 'impurpled' read 'in purpled,' for 'ſhews' 'glows'
59, line 3, and wherever the word is, for 'can't' read 'cannot.'
79, line 1, and wherever the word is, for 'don't' read 'do not.'
101, firſt line of the note, after 'late' inſert 'John.'
103, firſt note, after 'Johnſton' inſert 'Bart.'
109, Dele from 'He' in line 12 to 'objection' in line 18.
line 18, for 'next' read 'firſt.'
122, line 13, for 'precipitious' read 'precipicious.'
172, Dele the laſt line of the note, and add 'The ſame error is copied by WEEVER (p. 210) from STOW's *Annals*. Haveringof Bower, and *of the* Bower are in FROISSART. FABIAN calls the place *Haverynge Bower*.
176, 2d note line 5, for 'the' read 'this.'
195, line 5, after 'Shakeſpeare' inſert 'and Fielding'
204, line 13, the inverted commas (") ſhould begin after 'when'.